

Appl. No. 10/777,796
Amdt. dated March 28, 2005
Reply to Office action of October 26, 2004

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Figs. 3K - 3N. This sheet, which includes Figs. 3K - 3N replaces the original sheet including Figs. 3K- 3N. In Figs. 3K- 3N, the previously omitted element 90 has been added.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet
 Annotated Sheet Showing Changes in Red.

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS:

REMARKS:

The examiner objected to drawings because reference character 64 was used to designate both “pressure supply valve” and “pressure regulator”. The specification has been corrected so that only the term “pressure regulator” is used in connection with reference character 64. Because of the amendment of the specification, the drawings did not need to be changed.

The examiner objected to drawings because reference character 72D was used to designate both “combustion initiators” and “ignition initiators”. The specification has been corrected so that only the term “ignition initiators” is used in connection with reference character 72D. Because of the amendment of the specification, the drawings did not need to be changed.

The examiner objected to drawings because reference character 90 was in connection with an “indexing portion” but was not indicated in the drawings. Sheet 17 of the drawings has been corrected to add an indication for reference character 90. The examiner also objected to the drawings because the reference character 92B was associated with both “a scalloped retaining disc” and “a retaining disc” The specification has been corrected so that only the term “retaining disc” is used in connection with reference character 82B.

The examiner objected to the specification because it did not include a brief description for Fig. 1A. The specification has been amended to add a brief description of Fig. 1A.

The objection to claim 1 is moot because claim 1 has been canceled. The applicant has implemented the requested renumbering of the claim following claim 13. The new claim numbering is followed in the amendment to the claims given above.

The phrase "may be" is not present in the amended claims.

Claim Rejections and Objections:

The examiner rejected claims 1-5, 7-9, 13-15 under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent 4,215,659 by Lowther. The examiner rejected claims 10,11 and 18-22 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 4,215,659 by Lowther in view of US Patent 5,711,265 by Duve. The examiner rejected claim 12 and 24-25 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 4,215,659 by Lowther in view of US Patent 4,898,641 by Jones et al. The examiner objected to claims 6, 17 and 23 for being dependent upon rejected claims but indicated that 6, 17 and 23 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Further, the examiner indicated that claim 16 would be allowable if rewritten to remove the offending phrase "may be" which, in the examiners opinion renders the claim indefinite under 35 USC §112, 2nd paragraph.

By this amendment, claims 1-5, 7, 8, 13, 21 and 22 have been canceled. Claims 6, 9-12, 14, 15, 16-20, 23 -25 have been amended. Claim 6 has been amended to an independent claim which includes limitations similar to original and now canceled claim 1 and original claim 6. Claims 9-12, 14, and 15 are amended to depend from claim 6. Claim 16 (formerly claim 17) has been amended to an independent claim which includes limitations similar to original and now canceled claim 1 and original claim 16 (formerly claim 17). Claims 16-20 (formerly claims 17-21) are amended to depend from claim 16. Claim 23 (formerly claim 24) has been amended to an independent claim substantially incorporating the limitations of old claim 19 (renumbered to claim 18) and claim 23 (formerly claim 24). Claim 24 has been amended to depend from claim 23. Claim 25 has been amended as an independent claim. The total number of independent claims has increased from 2 to 4, thus exceeding the limit of 3 by one claim. Accordingly, an additional \$100.00, the small entity fee for independent claim exceeding 3 independent claims, is enclosed herewith.

The applicant submits that with the above amendment, the claims now define allowable subject matter. The above amended claims are intended to define that which the applicant understands to be the allowable subject matter indicated in the Office Action of 26 October 2004.

Appl. No. 10/777,796
Amdt. dated March 28, 2005
Reply to Office action of October 26, 2004

Applicant respectfully submits that the specification, claims and drawings are now in proper form, and that the pending claims define allowable subject matter. Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully Submitted,



Robert O. Blinn
P.O. Box 75144
Wichita, KS 67275-0144
Reg. No.: 36,751

3/28/05
Date





FIG. 3K




FIG. 3M




FIG. 3N

FIG. 3L